

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, March 30, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

## BILL 26 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has 30 minutes.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the lunch break I was attempting to bring forward a comment about the way in which the provincial government's handling of the expenditures on health are providing for the basic erosion of health care and education in the province, by simply not living up to their own commitments in this field.

Let me put some numbers around it, just to tie it down more specifically. If we look at the increased expenditures in the established programs of Medicare and health insurance that was announced this year in our Estimates, we're talking about \$35 million increase in this area. If you look at the actual cash transfers — and I'm not talking about the tax point part of the EPF but just the cash transfers themselves — they amount to \$36.5 million.

In other words, if those figures are accurate and I have no reason to say they're not, the total increase that the province is saying it's putting into those fields are accounted for by the increase in federal fiscal transfers under this program just in the cash alone. That doesn't include the tax point proportion of the extended financial package.

Another exale, Mr. Speaker, in one of the other components of the new program was in the field of extended home care. In this area you find that the increase in continuing care by the province is some \$300,000 in this year's Estimates.

Now, if you look at the formula under the EPF, it started out with a base grant of \$20 per capita and has now risen on an escalator clause up to about \$24 or \$25.00. So, again, the total increase under continuing care is once again accounted for virtually by the increase in federal fiscal transfers under the extended fiscal program.

It simply means, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's quite clear . . . In fact I could use the Minister of Finance's own words for it, he seems, at least last year, to understand what the EPF was all about and I would quote from the Budget Address of 1978 where he said, "Changes have also been necessary as a follow-up to the new federal-provincial established programs financing arrangements, which have replaced direct cost-sharing for hospital insurance, Medicare, extended health services and post-secondary education.

The Minister of Finance, in the 1978 Budget, recognized that that program was related to those four established components, not what he is saying now or what the First Minister is saying now, "Well, it's wide open. We can choose the priorities." He knew what the priorities were and what the understanding was in 1978. Come 1979, he seems to have changed his mind substantially and they now have established a very different rationale for the program.

Now, what is at stake, Mr. Speaker, is not the normal kind of federal-provincial wrangling over who pays for what. What is really at stake is the quality of medical and health care in the province. That's what we're really arguing about, because if in fact the province is withdrawing from these fields, if it is reducing its own commitment and subtracting its own fiscal revenues into this field, then the consequences are the reduced quality of care, and we don't have to repeat the many examples that have been brought forward over the past month or two in terms of the loss of specialist doctors to leaving the province and the bare-bones stripping of the hospital systems so that there are inabilities to provide the same quality of care in the hospitals; the increased fees in extended care programs; all those points that add up to a substantial decline in quality of care, can be traced back then, to this fundamental question that as federal contributions have gone up, the provincial ones have gone down. It's working in inverse proportion.

And I would assert, Mr. Speaker, with every single, sort of ounce of surety, that that was the clear understanding in the 1976 federal-provincial meetings, that the extended program was for these fields, not for general revenue sharing. Now, the only caveat, the only sort of qualification, you could say, is that at that point in time as well, there was a certain phasing out of the revenue guarantees going back to the Carter Commission introductions of 1972. And the provinces, at that time, very clearly said, we want more, we want some compensation for the fact that the federal

government was phasing out its transition payments.

But they got their compensation, Mr. Speaker, they got an extra tax point under this program. And the kind of moneys I'm talking about don't include the tax points, they in fact talk about the cash transfers that are going on.

It's also very clear, Mr. Speaker, and this is also an important point, this is at a very important point, and this Minister of Fitness and whatever it is, sort of mental activity, or whatever it's supposed to be. . .

**A MEMBER:** Hardly.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** . . . totally misunderstands because, do you know who was asking for this commitment. It was the provincial governments. They were going to the federal government and saying, look, let's make the arrangements more flexible so that we can introduce more alternative programs in health care and in education. They didn't say, we want to put it into roads or into whatever other programs. They said, we want a different formula, and they were asking the federal government, it started with Alberta and Ontario and was followed by the other provinces, they said, we want to get away from the conditional 50-50 arrangement because it's too rigid. We want to try — and catch this, Mr. Speaker — we want to try alternatives such as community health clinics, because that is a way of providing alternative care which isn't as costly as hospital beds. We want to provide nutrition and preventative medicine alternatives.

I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that if we go back and look at the statements made by the present Minister of Health when he was in opposition, because we used to join forces at that time, he was making arguments for the same thing at that time. And there was never, at any time during any of those discussions, any intimation or suggestion on the part of the provinces that they would in fact be using this as general revenue sharing. They said it was going to be revenue sharing directed towards the areas of health and education, but that they wanted this kind of formula in order to provide for a more flexible alternative program arrangements within it. And that's the reason they wanted it.

So for the First Minister to get up on his radio show this morning, or for the Minister of Finance to say, no, that wasn't the deal, it's simply a rewriting of history. We've now got Tory history coming together in this province, being used to justify what is now, and obviously in 1979, rationalization under their budgets and their Estimates. And they can't escape those facts, Mr. Speaker.

It happens to be historical reality that those were the demands made by the provinces, responded to by the federal government, with a clear understanding that the money would be used for these purposes. And what we are finding now is that in fact the money is, by the sleight-of-hand going off, they say, well, we are still putting all this federal money into health and education, but what they're not saying is, but we're withdrawing our equal commitments and moving into something else. It's the old shell game, you know, where's the pea under the pod and you keep moving it around, you never know where it's going to end up. Well, Mr. Speaker, we found where the pea in the pod is. And it's sitting right over there, I think, in that center desk. —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm sure they're going to fix it after May. If somehow or other the world turned upside down and the Tories were elected, they'd really fix it. They'd start applying the same arithmetic in the federal level as they do here and by that point in time, I don't know who we'd get our money from at that point. We'd have to, I guess, go to their friends, the multi-national oil companies who seem to be so friendly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's come to another example which maybe hasn't come forward in this House and that has to do with education. Let me give you an example that the cash transfers, and again I'm not talking of the Tax point portion, just the transfers, that the provincial government received in 1978-1979 was 63.8 million. This year it is \$76 million. That is a net increase of \$12 million from this year over last year. If you look at the increases in our Estimates Book that is apportioned to Community Colleges and University Grants Commissions, the post-Secondary Institution, the grand total of increase is \$6.2 million, exactly one-half of the actual increase being received by this province for post-Secondary Education. Boy, the generosity overwhelms me. And at the same time, tuition fees are going up, faculty salaries are now amongst the lowest in the country, research facilities are leaving, Capital facilities can't be built because there's no one to staff them and the quality of education is being suffered — you don't have to listen to any university president to tell you that — yet we're not even spending the actual increases that we're getting. We're cutting it in half. We are in fact, gypping post-Secondary institution of \$6 million which is part of their apportionment. Now, I don't know where the money is being hidden, God knows where it's being divested, it may be some other purpose.

But again, we come down to a simple, fundamental fact. —(Interjection)— The Feds did not make that possible. The Member for Inkster was a member of a government which asked the federal

government to do it. —(Interjection)— You you agreed to the compromise that was made. Let's go that the formula first was a total transfer at tax points coming from Ontario and Alberta.

**MR. GREEN:** We didn't want that, either.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** They didn't want that either, but they also are provinces and they were in that Conference, and the agreement was made that there would be cash transfers to equalize for the poorer provinces which was agreed to. So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we now are in the position where the Extended Programs are not being apportioned to the uses for which they were intended. The impact again in the field of Education has been revealed and talked about many times in this House and in this province and it is equally serious, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the consequences of this kind of financial rigmarole because if there's any area again which is required to maintain a certain degree of quality in this province, it is extended and reflected in your institutions of learning and of Education.

And the fact of the matter is that we now are facing a situation where we are in danger of losing senior, respected faculty members simply because we can't keep up on salaries. We are going to face, the First Minister poopohdd the idea, but we have the Province of Alberta that is going to initiate raiding of our medical research faculties with their little \$30 million poke that comes out of their Resource revenues which we're not asking for part of. Another good Conservative plank and program. And they're going to come here and say, look, why stick around this province? The provincial government isn't giving you any more. So the question I would really raise at this point in time to the Minister of Finance and the First Minister and all these other spokesmen is we could change things around in this province pretty quickly if we simply anted up that extra \$6 million that was taken away that rightfully belongs to higher education — in the community colleges and the universities. We would be able to provide the kind of incentive that's being asked for in terms of putting together proper libraries, and research facilities, and keeping the kind of faculty, and keeping the hold on tuition fee increases.

And in effect, Mr. Speaker, you know that's very little to ask because it's not even costing the province, in terms of its own tax revenues, more money. Because I'm not talking about the tax points that they were given. They still received, what — 13 tax points, personal income tax points and one corporate income tax point. And I'm not even talking about the revenue derived from that. I'm simply talking about the cash transfers they've received. So they can still keep their tax points and use that to allocate as they see fit.

So, Mr. Speaker, we really are in a strange and eerie time, and the fact that they're not even prepared to spend the money that's allocated in areas which the suffering and the erosion is becoming more and more apparent. And furthermore, it is foolhardy because as soon as we begin to allow these two fundamental areas of our community, the health institutions and the educational institutions, to become substandard, to erode, then the whole community suffers, but they had provided for many years, the basis for a lot of economic growth and development in this province, a lot of job opportunities, a lot of the kind of assets that are needed to attract other industries. You talk to companies — why do you come to Manitoba? One of the things we have had to sell is good universities, proper research, traieed skilled people.

Well, as soon as we begin reducing that, then that asset as an incentive for development and for coming to this province will be thereby reduced. Look at the situation we're facing now. There was a big fight here about the accreditation of our Engineering faculty; that simply the engineers are saying that the university won't give us enough money. We're losing faculty, we can't keep our standards up. We're fearful of losing our accreditation. Once that happens, the degree isn't as good, a whole series of repercussions flow from that in terms of what we have to offer people coming to this province. And how much would it take of that \$6 million that's been squirreled off into some other pigeon hole that we don't know about? Not a great deal. And that's why I find, Mr. Speaker, it hard to understand why the government has engaged in this kind of subterfuge. I would think simply that the arrangements that were established back in 1976 and 1977 were established for very clear purposes. There was no ambiguity about it whatsoever. They were designated within those specified programmed areas. The setting of priorities and the flexibility was to be within those areas, not without them. And there was never any record of any provincial minister suggesting that it would be otherwise.

Now we have this government saying it is otherwise. And what they are going to be guilty of, and if that particular performance continues, it is the Balkanization of this country, because once we begin to break down those basic agreements about common bases of programs, so that there is an acceptance of some degree of standards across the country regardless of whether you are in a province which has a large corporate tax base or one that has a small corporate tax base. Once we allow that to happen then the Balkanization really begins to appear. And that really is

the warning that we're beginning to see. It's not a complete one, but that's what the signs portend in this kind of fiscal manipulation.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it's very clear that what we have to simply insist upon is a very different kind of accounting from this government and a basic change in the application and allocation of the extended fiscal program, that it should be used for the purposes for which it was intended, and then let them choose between programs within that, keeping in mind always that there must be basic standards of access and basic standards compatible and portable with other provinces. That's what that program is all about. The other revenue sharing proportions of the program, the sharing of tax points, is up to them.

Now, the argument that we can expect back is the one that's saying, well, I think we've dismissed, or should have dismissed by now, this idea that they have total licence to lay this money around in whatever sort of cubby-hole they care to put it in, and what we should be making very clear is maybe re-evaluating this whole question of the revenue-sharing, revenue-transferring system. It certainly gained a lot of — everyone was on the band wagon for two or three years — that that was the way to go. But we're finding that the revenue-sharing that the province uses with the municipalities has an awful lot of hidden and unfortunate consequences to it because of what the cities and municipalities are able to do, and we're finding the same thing is true in the Federal-Provincial field, and that those old, tired, sort of conditional grants that everyone was so disparaging of may start to look better and better as we go along simply because it does allow the Federal Government at least to insist upon certain basic standards.

So I really feel, Mr. Speaker, that under these two programs, the Educational and the Health Program, the transfers that were allocated for those reasons should be kept and I would go one step further — I would suggest there should be some very deep rethinking on the part of members opposite about whether it's not time that they begin to ask questions of their own Treasury Bench about whether that money shouldn't be restored to its rightful place, that it shouldn't be put back in to where it belongs. As we go through these Estimates it's still not too late to take a look at some supplementary changes so that there is a more genuine and bona fide allocation according to the principles of the extended Finance Program. Without doing that we really are short-changing those institutions, and all the sound and fury that's been expressed here begins to find its source in this kind of financial formula that the Provincial Government is now trying to rationalize for us. I think, Mr. Speaker, that really the question that faces us at this point in time is that the fiscal arrangements are being abused and the people who are suffering are those who require good medical care and good education, and that's really what this debate is all about.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I recognize the Honourable Member for Burrows, I would like to introduce to the members of the Assembly 25 students from Samuel Hearne School at Inuvik in the Northwest Territories. These are grade 8 students under the direction of Mr. Wallace Murphy, Mrs. Darlene Avey and Mr. Joe Teddy. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Honourable Member for Burrows for permitting me to get into the speaking rotation at this time. I welcome the opportunity to enter the debate at this juncture and speak in defense of the government's interim supply bill and comment on some of the arguments and some of the positions that have been put forward up to this point in time. I've followed the debate with considerable interest, Mr. Speaker, I've been here through most of it and I appreciate the vein and plain of the debate. I do not challenge the right of members opposite to have put the positions that they have put with respect to the government's policies and programs as they've been discussed in this debate thus far, but I think it is essential that the record be stright, that the other side of the coin be presented for the record because a number of positions that have been advanced are not in my view, and I would suggest that the facts will testify to that, are not accurate, are not correct and should not be permitted to stand unchallenged. There are distortions and exaggerations of a position that are being disseminated, that are not worthy of either the opposition in this House or the federal government of the day that is carrying the same distortions across the land in what I think is a pretty desperate electioneering tactic and I want to put the other side and the accurate side of that and several other questions.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has put forward a position that is being espoused ever more widely these days by the federal government and has been picked up or perhaps even was initiated by the federal New Democratic Party and has been picked up by the opposition in this House, which is intended to portray the federal Liberals, at least, if not their roommates, the NDP, but the federal Liberals at least as the saviours of Medicare, the party that is going to go forth across this land for the next eight weeks, create the spectre of the destruction of Medicare, lay

the blame on the Conservative administrations across this country and try to establish themselves as the defender of the average person, the average citizen and his or her right to the universal accessibility principles and all the other principles of Medicare to which all of us essentially subscribe. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for Inkster says he agrees with me, that the Liberals are to blame, the federal Liberals are to blame. I accept that as a ringing and a very much appreciated endorsement, because we don't agree all that often. —(Interjection)—

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular position is being contrived and constructed by a Liberal government that has failed in every responsibility of government, in every responsibility of its mandate in this country over the past ten years, that is desperately searching for some kind of straw to clutch to, to carry it through the next eight weeks of the federal campaign, and that has concocted — and concocted, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, rather deceptively — a position that is dishonest, a position that is dishonest and inaccurate and is as damaging, in fact, to the previous government of this province in its moral and ethical implications, as damaging in fact to that previous government, the New Democratic government, as it is to the present Progressive Conservative government of this province. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that nobody in this House, New Democrat or Conservative, and nobody, to my knowledge, in any other House across this land, New Democrat or Conservative, went rushing out to embrace the established program's financing legislation, which was rammed down the throats of the provinces and the Canadian public on April 1, 1977, by that present administration that has now gone to the people in Ottawa to ask for a renewed mandate.

That is what precisely, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface can have his say. I've permitted him to make his statement, Mr. Speaker, and I want it clearly understood that that program was a concoction of the federal government. They felt that it was going to be a way to save money in health care costs; they felt that by getting away from CAP and VRDP, particularly CAP in the health field, health and post-secondary education, that there would be savings downstream. They've found out because of uncontrollable factors in the economy, plus the efforts of a number of administrations across the land, to exercise much-needed restraint, that it's winding up costing them more money, there is a threat that it's going to cost them more money than they had ever thought it would, and that CAP arrangements would have.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Chretien, attempted, earlier this year to secure provincial agreement to a reduction in the EPF growth rate for 1979-80, and subsequent years. He did that because he could see that this concoction of April 1, 1977, which was supposed to reduce costs to the federal government, is not in fact reducing costs to the federal government, that the growth of federal transfers under EPF has been artificially expanded because of the factors in the economy over which the government has had no direct control. One is the growth of the Gross National Product; another has been the increases in indexing; another has been the sluggish national economy generally.

So that Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a federal government that's trying to get out from under, now trying to blame everybody else for a mistake in strategy and in projected reading of the performance of the economy that it made itself. And for the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge to link and pin his federal election hopes and his campaign hopes on that argument, I suggest to him, is going to be an unproductive exercise, because we intend to fight that argument throughout every corner of every constituency in which it's raised in the next eight weeks, because it's simply not true. It is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, there is considerable criticism of the manner in which the provincial government has approached funding for health, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is as spurious and as specious as the argument raised by the federal government on the EPF issue generally. There is no specific allocation of EPF financing for health, for insured hospitalization, for medicare, and for post-secondary education under the arrangement with the provinces. The allocation that is being promoted and being publicized around the land now by the Liberal publicists, is an artificial one being undertaken by the Liberal government to serve its own purposes. There was no such allocation, and I have had this checked out very thoroughly with my own department officials and with officials of the Department of Finance. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that EPF financing is not ear-marked for specific programs in the health and post-secondary education field; under the old cost-sharing arrangements, federal funding was so ear-marked. But the funds under EPF can be allocated by recipient provinces among a broad range of programs, according to their own priorities.

So to accuse the province of Manitoba, or any other province, of violating an agreement or a legal arrangement, or some kind of contract, is simply false. That has not happened. Ottawa provides a kind of a hypothetical allocation of federal funds among hospital insurance, medicare and post-secondary education, but I repeat, Mr. Speaker, these are for their own purposes. They are set out in their own publicity, they're set out in their own publications, but there is nothing set out between Ottawa and the provinces and they have no significance whatsoever with respect

to the specific allocations that the provinces decide upon.

Another point for the record, Mr. Speaker, and I'm addressing myself to this particular argument for the first portion of my allotted time because I think it's important that the record be set straight here. The federal figures for the health programs, I'm advised are inflated artificially through the inclusion of an extra tax point and related cash, which Ottawa added to the EPF package when it refused to extend the 1972-76 Income Tax revenue guarantee arrangement. Mr. Speaker, that represents another piece of political artifice and electioneering strategy bordering on subterfuge. The figures themselves are artificially inflated.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that must be emphasized —(Interjection)— well, it's there in the publicity that's being disseminated by the federal government. The other point that must be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, is that we're dealing here with a field of federal transfers. We're not dealing with one specific transfer. I was asked whether I knew specifically what was coming from the federal government for health, for hospitalization and medicare, and I answered truthfully and honestly, no, I didn't know the specific figure coming for health under the federal transfer, because the manner in which the government approaches the budgetary problems and the budgetary challenges of the province is to look at what we have in terms of revenues that we can count on, federal and provincial. That globe that then becomes the amount of money, becomes the amount of available financing and funding on which we develop our programs, and for which individual Cabinet Ministers compete, as has always been the free and democratic case, for allotments and for shares of the budget. I believe that Health and Community Services did reasonably well with a 7.2 percent increase, with a budget that is not far off 40 percent of the total provincial budget and that is not below the apportionment of the budget that has gone to Health and Community Services in recent years.

In 1977-78, and I've subtracted the figures for Corrections from these totals, we looked at a budget in Health and Community Services of \$619 million out of a total budget of \$1.6 billion. In 1978-79 we looked at \$635 million out of a total budget of \$.648 billion. And this year, 1979-80, the year we're coming into, our Health and Community Services budget including Corrections is \$683 million out of a provincial budget of \$1.77 billion. So the percentages have not declined, the proportion has not declined. We're putting the same amount, in fact indeed, Sir, in some areas, we're putting fractionally more into Health and Community Services than has been the case and and is on the record for this province over recent years spanning two administrations. Now, the Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Fort Rouge make much of the fact that the percentage in terms of what is coming from the federal government has declined. What's that got to do with the question, Mr. Speaker? What we're concerned with is the total amount of money that Manitobans have available to spend on necessary programs, whether it comes from the federal government or from provincial sources, it's all the same taxpayer — at least at the Manitoba level it's all the same taxpayer — it all adds up to the amount of revenue that we have available here in Manitoba to fund the necessary services and programs in existence. And it all adds up to what we have to as Cabinet Ministers work from with the Minister of Finance in determining what we're going to have for our individual budgets. And the individual budget of Health and Community Services has not suffered. It's as good or better than it ever was. Out of that total provincial budget, out of the total provincial budget the available revenues the Department of Health and Community Services is receiving and will be expending something between 36 and 39 percent and that is as high or higher as in previous years. That is the point. Surely we have to deal with the amount of revenue that's available.

When you look at the whole field of federal transfers, Mr. Speaker, which is the only fair way to look at it, I can assure you that some federal transfers are down. Some have improved only fractionally. Some have barely improved at all and some of them, including equalization payments, are down. How can you separate one federal transfer item, one component out of the whole spectrum of federal transfers? You can't do that. You can't do that. What we're we have to live on is the amount of money available to us. And if federal transfer on one side are up I want to assure you that on the other side of the equation they are down and we have a certain limited amount of money to work from and Health and Community Services is getting the same percentage or a fractionally better percentage of that pie, of the total available amount as we have ever got.

Mr. Speaker' the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge said that it's no longer a 50-50 dollar. It's now a 40-60 dollar. Well, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that's not correct. That's not correct. That isn't correct, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that in taking the overall amount of money available to us the provincial share is actually higher, is actually higher than it was before. If you take the EPF cash for health programs and add it to the CAP recoveries, and there's still some, and the total federal contributions towards Health and Community Services are set against total department and Manitoba Health Services Commission expenditures, the federal transfers don't cover half the province's total expenditures. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— That's not a 40-60 dollar.

That's not a 40-60 dollar, Mr. Speaker.

There was a \$20 per capita sweetener that was thrown into the pot when the EPF arrangements were introduced. Now, it should be recognized, Mr. Speaker, for the record also, that when that sweetener was thrown into the pot, the previous Minister of Health, the Honourable Mark Lalonde had made promises to share in certain health costs which were not then subject to cost-sharing and in part that sweetener was introduced into the arrangements to compensate for the fact that the federal authorities had backed out of that promise. Contained in that \$20 per capita sweetener were some institutional costs in mental retardation which were shared under the Welfare side — that's the Canada Assistance Plan — so that they gave us \$20 per capita but they took away \$4 million, 4 dollars per capita from the CAP money. I want to repeat in the strongest terms that I can, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government of Manitoba, the Province of Manitoba, under a previous administration and under the present administration, was confronted with something that it did not ask for, it did not campaign for, did not appeal for, was not very enthusiastic about accepting, was committed to accepting because of the insistence of the federal government. And we're into a program in which revenues for Manitoba are projected to reduce, to slide down over a ten-year period. We're into a program in which we have to, obviously, exercise some foresight in terms of the downstream commitments that we will encounter. What good is it to accept an artificial dollar, an artificial handout from Ottawa today to pump new capital projects and programs into the province that can't be maintained seven, eight, nine years from now when the Federal funding and Federal financing arrangements are modified again, and when we are left in the province holding the bag, having to pay for the cost of the capital that was originally invested and the operating cost. That, Sir, is a familiar trap into which Manitobans and other provinces in this country have all too frequently found themselves lured by Ottawa.

And a classic example is the pressure play, the other political ploy that the Federal government has applied to us with respect to the financing so-called, the equal dollar, so-called for a new arena here in Winnipeg. They came into Winnipeg without any consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, put this government squarely on the hook for a commitment on a contribution, a matching dollar. It turned out that what they were offering us was a 33-cent dollar. We've been led down the - garden path on 50cent dollars for many many years in the provinces, Mr. Speaker. In this case what was being dangled and is still being dangled in front of us is a 33-cent dollar, without any consultation, without any communication. Well, the EPF arrangements aren't much different from that. What the federal members and the federal candidates are saying today is, "Take all that money and go out and spend it." Sure, that's great. In the meantime, we're being levelled down; in the meantime, over the course of the 10 years, we're going to be getting less under the EPF arrangements. We're going to have taken that money, if we follow their advice, plunked it into projects and programs that are going to carry ongoing costs forever and you and I and the rest of Manitobans are going to be left struggling, trying to pay for that, six, seven, eight and 10 years down the road. —(Interjection)—

Well, the Member for Rupertsland says, "What about basic services?" Basic services are in place and are being maintained.

What we have done is taken the available revenues, federal and provincial, we have taken a Budget of \$1.7 billion and we have allocated nearly 40 percent — between 36 and 39 percent — of that to Health and Community Services. And I don't see how the members on the other side can twist and distort that, Mr. Speaker, into a reduction, into a purported reduction, in spending on health care and Health and Community Services.

Mr. Speaker, you know there might have been a lot more money around to do a lot more things in this province if we hadn't gone through eight years of wild spending under the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to do some very quick mental calculations when you're listening next to the members opposite cry about personal care homes and hospitals and hospital beds, let's just take a look at a couple of the irresponsible investments that they made in this province — and I'm not going into the ones in the economic field — but let us look, for example, at the \$4.5 million spent on the Government Services Building in Dauphin, which was not needed and which the people of Dauphin would tell them and told them was not needed. You know what that \$4.5 million would have built, Mr. Speaker? 130 personal care beds. We could have had 130 personal care beds instead of that \$4.5 million office building. The \$3 million provincial garage would have provided 90 to 95 personal care beds.

They are over there screaming about lack of personal care beds and lack of hospital equipment, and lack of hospital facilities. It didn't mean anything to them to design a Taj Mahal for Brandon to replace the Correctional Institution there that is costing twice what this government or any sensible government would have spent on it, costing twice that in Capital costs not to mention the staffing costs, Mr. Speaker. That jail in Brandon . . . The Member for Elmwood the other night said to

me that that design was created with the help of a respected out-of-province correctional consultant who designed it, "in line with modern correctional practices". —(Interjection)— Yes, using whose money, Mr. Speaker? Not using his money, because that's not the way that government operated. If you are using taxpayers' money it doesn't matter how much the thing costs. Spend it; spend it. Design it to the heavens. That's what happened.

We inherited a design that was going to cost, originally, something in the neighbourhood of \$6 million — slightly under \$6 million. They were going to put 68 persons in it, Mr. Speaker. It was going to require an additional 28 staff over and above the staff that is presently related to the Brandon Correctional Institute. Why? Because it was designed in such a way that you needed two or three security people to keep an eye on the inmates, instead of one; because it was designed in such a way that everybody was going to have privacy, complete privacy, even privacy from the security staff. Everybody was going to have lots of room to rattle around in and the taxpayers of Manitoba, being led down the garden path by a "respected out-of-province correctional consultant" were going to pick up the tab.

That's exactly the situation and the condition which we inherited in this province and why there is some difficulty now in meeting some of those requests and requirements that are legitimate, and in responding to some of those cries and whines that, for the most part, are totally not legitimate, coming from the Opposition in the Health, Community Services and Corrections field.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some length. We could look at the Seven Oaks Hospital, the size of five football fields. Virtually the whole main floor, well, not the whole main floor but virtually the whole main floor designed to deliver all kinds of social outreaches. It doesn't matter to them that the NorWest Clinic, the community health centre, is out there; they were going to add another community health centre. They were going to add the biggest community clinic west of Moscow, Mr. Speaker, out there at Seven Oaks. And they were expecting the taxpayer to pick up all of that cost, \$32 million Capital. That's an essential.

I don't question the essential need of a hospital in the northwest quadrant of Winnipeg, but, Mr. Speaker, this government and no sensible government would have poured \$32 million Capital into that kind of a concept, when they seriously felt, if they seriously felt, that they needed hospitals and personal care beds in other parts of Winnipeg and Manitoba. And for them to stand up and whine about personal care beds, when they took \$32 million Capital from you and other Manitobans and they are going to take \$17 million a year in operating costs to maintain that monolith out there, which is twice as big as it needs to be, which is going to produce, under their design, another community clinic for the area that already has a community clinic. That, Sir, makes their position totally ludicrous. It's totally indefensible. What they can't stand is that some government has come into office and seen the folly of their attitudes and their practices and their policies and is now exposing them for the wasteful spendthrift administration that they were. —(Interjection)—

The Member for St. Boniface has asked me — where did we waste money? I'm telling them where they wasted money. I'm telling them where they wasted money. I told the Member for St. Boniface I would debate him on where he and his government wasted money. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, that is not true. I said I will tell you where you and your government wasted money with an impact on health. —(Interjection)— Well, the Seven Oaks Hospital is certainly in Health. This has an impact on health.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Why didn't you cancel it?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Why didn't we cancel it, he says, Mr. Speaker. Why didn't we cancel it? It was already in the ground and underway. We already had commitments. There were commitments to the people, there were commitments to the contractors. Why didn't we cancel it? What we would have liked to have done would be redesign it on a smaller scale. That was impossible.

But I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker, we intend to change the functional program. We intend to change the functional program to spend \$32 to \$34 million capital out there for what in effect is just designed on the Tulchinsky model, the former Deputy Minister of Health, as a grandiose community clinic is absolutely unacceptable to the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

It's going to be a hospital. It's going to be a hospital and it's going to function as a hospital, just as the correctional institute at Brandon is going to be a jail and it's going to function as a jail. And the people who are paying for it, the taxpayers of Manitoba, are going to get their money's worth out of it. That is what this government is attempting to do.

**A MEMBER:** How can we afford the Health Science Centre?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster made one of the, I thought, more interesting



contributions to this debate when he spoke yesterday about a tale of two estates, and a tale of two governments, but I suggest that he overlooked an important analogy in comparison because he did not go on to talk about a tale of two trustees, and the contrast between those trustees of the public funds, the public's money, and our trusteeship of the public's money. And there, Sir, is the difference between day and night. That is why the people of Manitoba threw them out and elected this government. They are determined to run us down on the basis of the fiscal management we're trying to bring this province, and I expect every kind of attack, every kind of distortion, every kind of exaggeration.

It's being represented now; it's being represented now in this phony Medicare debate, where we get the Minister of National Health and Welfare accusing Manitobans of having a province in which opting out is threatening Medicare. Nothing could be further from the truth, but that's the kind of argument that they're using. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the biggest challenge that we have faced, the biggest challenge that we have faced in the interests of the Manitoba people, is to try to get our public spending house in order so that the services and programs that we have in place can be kept in place, and not threatened by ruin and bankruptcy. That's what we're trying to do. They can see that, but they're galled by the fact that it is a reality; they're galled by the fact that we're doing it, they're galled by the fact that we've got the courage to persist in doing it.

So they will maintain and continue to mount these kinds of contrived assaults on a policy that reflects a good deal more courage and commitment and principle than anything they demonstrated. We said we would get this province straightened out. They have asked us to do it overnight. They raise the phony spectre of seventeen months: "Why haven't you done it all?" The people of Manitoba know we can't do it in seventeen months but we're getting there, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba are getting there.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge said, for example, that with the condition with respect to funding and use of federal transfers today, that there is an increasing frequency of opting out, that doctors are leaving the province with frequency. I want to tell him that there is no increasing frequency of opting out, that after ten years of Medicare, only 10 percent of Manitoba's doctors are opted out and half of them aren't "extra billing". I want to tell him that last year across Canada, in excess of 800 professionals, highly skilled professionals in the medical field, left Canada and went to the United States. Forty-three of them were from Manitoba, which is not a record that I'm proud of, but that's 5 percent and that's what our population percentage is, 5 percent of the national figure. The myth that all of this is confined to Manitoba and unique to Manitoba, is simply that and nothing more, Mr. Speaker, a political myth designed and used for political purposes. These problems exist across this country.

Ontario is having as much, if not more, difficulty in retaining its professionals against the recruiting drives of the more lucrative opportunities in the United States. Alberta is having similar problems. I will agree that there are some provinces in this country that are having problems indeed with extra billing and with opting out, but Manitoba is not one of them and Manitoba is not suffering to any greater degree than any other province in this country is with respect to retention of its professionals. It is not a record to be proud of for Manitobans, but it is not a record to be proud of for Canadians generally, coast to coast, we all have to work to hold our professionals here.

The Member for St. Boniface, you know, he's pretty shrewd the way he approaches things. He's trying to be on two sides of this 8.1 percent fee schedule increase for the doctors. He is protesting very loudly that he's not criticizing that; "But why do we give them 8.1 percent when somebody else only gets 6 percent?" Well, if that isn't criticizing. . . —(Interjection)— Well, that's fine, but then let him stand up and criticize it, and I'll tell him why, I'll tell him why, Mr. Speaker, because in eight years of NDP administration the doctors in this province were squeezed down from an income earning opportunity that saw them in sixth place in the national scale to ninth place in the national scale, and we can't retain them at that level. We have to try to give them some attractions and create some climate here that is attractive to them. They made their plans midway through the NDP administration to leave. That momentum was set in place and you don't turn that around overnight, and they know it; they know it. You don't change a practice from Winnipeg to Phoenix, Arizona, overnight. It takes time to plan those things. Those minds were made up midway through the NDP administrative period.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close on the note that the present provincial government, that this administration, has seen as its essential responsibility the need to guarantee our citizens the best quality health care and health delivery services that can possibly be maintained for them and delivered for them anywhere in Canada, and to do that, we've got to have the whole program, the whole provincial operation on a sound economic footing, a sound economic base, and the citizens of Manitoba know that. We have had excellent co-operation in that effort. We have introduced some expansions of programs, some new initiatives in programs this year; we will do more as time goes

on. We can't do it all in one year; we can't do it all in seventeen months. And I am not going to permit the Opposition, Liberal or NDP, the provincial opposition, or the federal government, to go out onto those federal hustings as they are going to attempt to do, and paint Manitoba as the bogeyman of Medicare because Medicare is secure in this province. It has been secure, it remains secure, but we have to improve the climate for our practitioners, and we intend to do what we can to improve that climate.

If the Member for St. Boniface wants to criticize that openly and honestly, he's welcome to it, but I find it ridiculous for him to posture the way he does and say that he is not criticizing it, but why should they get such and such. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister made a statement that is not correct and he knows it. At no time did I criticize the pay of the medical profession here at all. The only difference was when the controls were there and we had no say into what the maximum was.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** How much, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** One minute. You have one minute.

**MR. SHERMAN:** One minute. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other final point is the point having to do with hospital budgets. Another contrived argument on the part of the Opposition. The procedure that is going on now with the hospitals and their budgets is absolutely normal for this time of year and they know it. You know, the previous government engaged in seeking special warrants, passing special warrants whenever they needed it. We haven't done that. We have tried to estimate what we needed; we've gone to Supplementary Supply when we needed it, but they engaged in special warrants all the time, even when the House was sitting, to pick up additional expenditures that couldn't be foreseen and couldn't be predicted.

What we have done with the hospital budget is what we have done with the whole Estimates Book that they see in front of them. These are Estimates. We are going to try to come as close to hitting them 100 percent as we can. If we can't, some adjustments will have to be made. That is normal political practice. Discussions on budgets with the hospitals in February and March of each year are also normal political practice. So don't let them spread panic in the streets about the hospital budgets.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. .

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Minister of Health and Community Services and I was pleased with his speech because, Mr. Speaker, now we're getting the true picture of our Minister of Health and Community Services. It took a little while, but inevitably I knew it would occur, that mask that he likes to cover his face with, that image he likes to project of the bleeding hearts, you know he's for everybody, he's with everybody and he'd like to do everything for everybody, today's speech we saw that that is just a mask, just a mask. The fact is, he realizes he must do that for PR purposes, but basically, basically what he believes in came through today; that Manitoba which a year and a half ago he said had the highest standards of Health and Social Services in Canada, it's in Hansard, and he was proud of that. He can't say that today and what's more, he doesn't want to say it today. No way does he want to say it because he believes that one should stand on their own feet, he believes in individual responsibility, he has said so. He's told agencies that we, the government, believe that people should fend for themselves. Now it's all come together and what you have this year is the best example. He talks about the established program financing, EPF, and they have taken advantage of that block funding, and have reduced the amount of money that the province has put into those programs. Consciously, deliberately, they have reduced them and he knows it. He may not have known the amount — maybe he doesn't talk to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Finance doesn't talk to him — I don't know about their inner workings. But he knows very well that they are not matching the money coming from Ottawa. Now, he is right that legally they don't have to, but I want to tell him and I want to tell the Member for Fort Rouge, Manitoba vehemently opposed the first proposal to transfer everything to tax points and the final proposal which is half tax points and half per

capita block funding. I opposed it from 1972 on when the thing first surfaced, it took five years for the thing to develop. We finally had to yield when the Prime Minister of this country said, "That is it, we're going into the House of Commons with it, with a bill." The five years is up on Medicare — they had the right to do so, they didn't have to give notice and that was it.

No, but the Member for Fort Rouge implied that somehow, the former government had welcomed that it had gone along. But Mr. Speaker, let me tell him if he doesn't know it, his colleagues in other provinces, Alberta, Ontario, British Columbia, New Brunswick who just imposed a medicare levy according to today's paper, they all sat there and said, you know, the reason we want, although New Brunswick wasn't all that keen on it, but when they finally faced it, we don't intend that less should be spent on health or hospitalization, what we want really, is a little more elbow room so that we can develop alternatives to the rigid, narrow programs which the funding covered, because it was only acute care beds that the hospitalization Act covered. It was only fees to doctors that the Medicare Act covered; so, provinces did want more elbow room to develop more alternatives, more flexibility, alternatives to perhaps a more efficient way of delivering health, more preventative health programs. And they all said, "That's why we need the money, we do not intend to take advantage of the fact that this money is a block fund, it's not stipulated and we don't want it stipulated, and we don't want it to be earmarked only for acute care beds — we want the flexibility." But they all pledged that it would be spent in the field of health.

Mr. Speaker, this government is taking that money from Ottawa and they are spending it in any number of areas. They're saying, "This money is coming in to the consolidated fund, it's not going to the Health Services Commission, therefore, it's in the general pot and we will spend as our priorities dictate." Well, now we know what their priorities are — their priorities are that people should do for themselves. He says they've got to get a handle on the costs. You're not getting a handle on the costs, what you're really doing is passing the buck of the costs, you're passing it on to individuals in user fees. You're passing it on to municipalities and the property taxpayer, that's what you're doing. You are not going to reduce and you're not reducing the amounts spent in health services.

And the best example of that is the United States compared to Canada; the United States which doesn't have a health plan, their increases from 1970 to 1976 for health costs have exceeded the growth in Canada. The difference is that in the United States the individual carries the bulk of it or even joins Blue Cross, or some other insurance — he buys insurance. But the total expenditure is still being made, so when you say you've got to get a handle on it, what you mean is, you want your government to get out as fast as it can, because you believe in a passive government, you believe in a do-nothing government, you believe the individual should do for himself and you're prepared to hang everyone and yourself on that particular issue. Mr Speaker, the fact that it's 39 percent doesn't mean a thing. You know, you have a budget and you increase it by 3 percent, which is way below the level of inflation, particularly inflation in a labour-intensive field such as the social services which are very labour intensive. And, you say, "Well now, comparing one year over the year, it's 39 percent." That's right, it may be and maybe next year, you're going to get the same rate, you may even get to 41 percent, but the fact of the matter is you're taking your reducing bulk and comparing a small growth which then becomes a larger percentage of the pot.

Mr. Speaker, they have intentionally, consciously, without a doubt now, in my mind — I thought maybe they didn't know before — are taking moneys which were made available to the provinces, because the provinces said, "We want flexibility, we want to test out alternatives." They're taking their money and they're not using it in the field of health at all." And if you want proof of it, Mr. Speaker, community health centres is the best example. There is an area, where if there is ever going to be any hope of getting a handle on health costs, of getting at the root cause, and instead of treating sickness and trying to come to grips with health in a truly preventative sense, then community health centres are the way. But that's not the direction this government is going; they didn't say well, we'll take some of the money that Ottawa is giving us and we'll still match 50 percent and now we'll have money for health centres, we'll expand them. Not only are they not expanding them, there was a threat of cutting them out, and today he gets up on his hind feet and he says, "That Seven Oaks Hospital, that over-blown thing." Why, they were even going to put in — what is it, monolith? — they were even going to put in outreach programs. Isn't that terrible, what a terrible thing. Outreach programs into a community Why? Because he's wedded to the traditional idea. You get sick, you go to a doctor. You pay on a fee for service basis. You take a number. So that all this wringing of hands that we've seen this man do for seventeen months, about prevention, is just so much hogwash. That mask is off and the public now must see him for what he is. He's a rigid Tory like everyone else in that front bench. But he mouths a few more platitudes; maybe it's his background, maybe it's his training.

So Mr. Speaker, I can't argue with him when he says that they are not legally bound to match

the money s coming from Ottawa. That's true. They don't have to spend a cent for health. They can spend it all on highways. And Mr. Speaker, it so happens I asked that very question in Ottawa at a conference, when I challenged the Minister, Mark Lalonde, and my fellow Finance Ministers and Health Ministers at the time. What assurance did I have that in fact the moneys would be spend on health services? And Mr. Lalonde said, "Oh, I'm sure the provinces would want to maintain this", and the other ministers said, "Of course. We just want some flexibility, some alternative approaches. We just want elbow room."

And I predicted then that what would happen would be a fragmentation of services in Canada. That poor provinces could not spend as much per capita as wealthier provinces. Other provinces, with governments of a particular stripe would try to cut back because they didn't believe in these things. And the result is that, whereas a few years ago we in Canada could proudly say, whether you lived on the east coast or the west coast, there are basic standard services made available to a Canadian because he was a Canadian. We're losing that. And we're losing it fast, because it's just recent — it's only mid-1977 that this change took place and the full implications weren't known until 1978.

So how rapidly it's breaking down, and Manitoba's taking the lead. The Minister says, "We haven't lost many more doctors than we have in the past". —(Interjection)— I know that but I recall that Minister of Health and my colleague the former Minister of Health, this gentleman would get up and denounce the government, it was forcing, chasing doctors out of the province. It was nonsense then — the worst year for outflow was the year just finished. It wasn't in our years, it just occurred. It just occurred. And then he justifies it and says, "It's no higher percentage-wise than it is for the rest of Canada". So therefore, it can't be different here than the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt in my mind doctors will always leave. They are a mobile group in our society. They can afford to leave.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, doctors are very mobile. Doctors have the clout; they are the most organized group in our society. They are the most powerful union. They have two things going for them. First, they have their own organization which speaks for them, but the bigger clout of all is this: they are not very many in number, and they are in a position to impose a strike like no other group in our society. The lawyers can threaten to strike. It doesn't matter. People can live without them. People can live without them. Architects can threaten strikes. People can live without them. But a doctor, his method of strike is, if I don't like it here, I'm leaving, and he can pick up and go. And he's very mobile, and successfully So Mr. Speaker, let the Minister so.

not try to scare Manitobans or anyone on this side of the House, because frankly, the doctors will stay when it pays them to stay and they'll leave when it pays them to leave. Now, I've never been one of those that argued about the amount that a doctor earned. My quarrel with the doctors is the way they practice medicine. And this Minister has an opportunity with the block funding to change the patterns of practice in Manitoba, but is he taking advantage of it? No. He's cutting down what Manitoba's spending. Consciously. Because instead of encouraging health centres, instead of encouraging doctors to go on a sessional basis or even on an annual basis and working on an annual or monthly amount, rather than a fee for service, he is discouraging community health centres, he's threatening them with closure, and I'll bet my bottom dollar if they don't close down, they're going to have to get their doctors to apply for fee for service, and bill on a fee for service basis. And I bet you that'll happen.

—(Interjection)— That's right. That's what they want. I'd probably win that bet. You're darn right I'll win that bet. Because he wants the traditional approach. He's forcing them into it. So all this nonsense about new ways of doing things and preventative medicine and being concerned about changing the direction of our health system, is just so much rhetoric, that this man is so good at. And he's an expert.

But, Mr. Speaker, we now see that it is only rhetoric, that in fact he is a very traditional guy. He believes that people should do for themselves. He believes in traditional way of delivering services. He would rather people somehow, as he said, go back — I don't recall what the subject was, but he talked about the "Good Old Days" when family responsibilities — go back to the days when children looked after parents and parents looked after children. You know, he's back at the turn of the century. Those days are gone. And he should know it. He's talking about the extended family, which hasn't been around for at least 25 to 30 years. But he's talking, he'd like to bring it back. Well, not even the government can bring those things back. Those days — it's a different life style, entirely different world we live in now, and if the Minister thinks he can bring those back, he's really kidding himself and dreaming, at the expense of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister made quite a point about the fact that the Federal government sort

of inflated the figures by an extra one point, and that's sort of a sinful thing to do. Actually that one point is worth money to the government. So he's complaining, apparently, and the fact that the Federal government gave more money than even they anticipated. Now, why that's a complaint, I'm not sure. If you've gotten more money than you anticipated, he should have had no trouble at all in just the normal increase of provincial funding, which is to maintain the inflow into health services, at the rate of inflation. You're not keeping up with the rate of inflation and you know it. Whereas inflation is at 9 percent, last year you had a 3 percent increase. This year you're coming out with double the amount — 6 percent. Over a two-year period, you had 9 percent, which is about 4 ½ percent per year, of which most of that is Federal money. So that today, in the coming year, '79-80, the Federal government will be putting in about double what Manitoba is investing in health services. And you are proud of that? You're saying, "Well, that is getting a handle on the economy". All that that is doing is short-changing the system. You could maybe make that claim, Mr. Minister, if in fact everything was well in our hospitals and in Health Services. But they're not, every social agency is hurting, every hospital is hurting. The personal care homes are hurting. The home care system is crying; they're short-staffed.

He talked the other day about the number of people who have been paneled and the waiting lists of personal care homes has not grown. Do you know why they haven't grown? They're not paneling because they say you've got to wait a year and a half to two years, so really there's no sense in paneling. And they're just not paneling. And that's why it's not growing.

**A MEMBER:** It has to be an emergency to get on the waiting list.

**MR. MILLER:** Oh, if it's an emergency, you can get on the list. But otherwise you're not paneled — you're not paneled at all. So for the Minister to get up here and defend what is indefensible, to defend a program, a policy which is vicious, it is cutting down and it is giving as an excuse for its acute protracted restraint, we have no money, we can't afford it. What hypocrisy. They can afford it, because they are getting more money than ever from Ottawa. They can't afford it because they choose not to afford it. Because they're so busy giving up tax revenue to those who can most afford it.

You know, that Minister got up one day and announced that the special Social Allowance for Senior Citizens was going to be discontinued. It's a special program which I think covered only about 600 people. They would be allowed to continue, but no new entries would be permitted. It was a money-saving device, and his explanation was . . . you know, it wasn't really fair, there was an anomaly that certain senior citizens should be given the treatment different than other senior citizens. And therefore, we decided to discontinue that program. And there's only 650 people involved.

Mr. Speaker, how hypocritical can you be, talking about an anomaly, when this same Minister got up in support of his Finance Minister, who introduced a property tax credit program last year which did what? It paid an extra \$100 to every citizen who owned a house that it was over 65 years of age, and had the following qualifications — the following qualifications: (1) he had to have a high enough income so he wasn't entitled to more money when he filed his income tax on the property tax credit; (b) he had to have such an expensive house that the property tax credit he was receiving didn't cover the cost of education. Those are the two criteria. That's all you had to do — be rich, and a big house and then you qualified.

But, if you were disabled and over 65 and had to have certain requirements in your living conditions which the Minister acknowledged, then he didn't want an anomaly to exist. Then he didn't like to treat people differently. No, they should be treated like everybody else. So, they're not getting about \$125 more — well, that's tough. Have to let it go to be consistent. So where is this consistency? It's deceit. It's deceit, hypocrisy — a double standard if there ever was one.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister talks about "We've got to get our public spending in order" — he mentioned that. And he said "It takes time". Well, you know, they haven't needed much time. They, with the support of the Minister for Urban Affairs, have very rapidly moved to get the provincial spending house in order. They've put a cap on their expenditures towards the city.

**A MEMBER:** No.

**MR. MILLER:** Oh yes, their cap is a firm amount plus GMP, or plus what the province will spend on this budget next year. That's your cap. It's the same cap the federal government put on. And the federal government has a cap, even though the Minister thinks that they haven't. The fact is, the federal government has capped its spending in Medicare and hospitalization — no question. The fact that they are giving you more money than ever before it's only in relation to the little money that you're giving, but the fact is they have put a cap on their spending, and I think you

must know it.

But in the City of Winnipeg, you've put a cap on your spending. You've taken Public Health, the Public Health Unit, which did receive a special amount from the province because it is the only Public Health Unit which is not part of the Health and Social Services Department. The City of Winnipeg wanted to retain its own, so we said all right, retain its own and you'll get a grant which is based on the average cost. But that's not good enough for this government. They want to put a better cap on it. And the cap is it's part of a \$30 million total funding. It's autonomy. That autonomy's going to come back to haunt the City of Winnipeg let me tell you, it's going to come back to haunt it and some of the councillors know it. They know it, and I think the Minister knows it too. And the Minister knows it too.

It's going to haunt them because they're going to have to either cut back or they're going to have tax the property on it, and they'll end up taxing property which is what this government wants. It wants out. This government doesn't want to spend. It wants you, as a private individual, to spend; the municipality to spend; the school board to spend. As long as this provincial government can stand up and say "We, the provincial government, over the last three years, have reduced provincial expenditures by XXX millions — aren't we heroes?". The fact they've passed it on to everybody else doesn't matter. The fact that they've gotten more from Ottawa — they're spending all of the Ottawa money, I'm sure they are — they're taking that amount and they're spending it in Health. They're getting more from Ottawa than ever before. They're ignoring that. As a matter of fact, they're so busy teeing off on the federal government and saying that this federal government still hasn't got its House in order, and this federal government is still running up too many deficits, they don't believe when they say they're going to try to restrain the federal spending; they don't believe the federal government.

Why don't you send some of the money back? Why don't you be nice guys? Help the federal government. Send the money back, if that's how you feel. If you share their philosophy, if you really believe this, mister, then send the money back and say "You're giving us too much. We don't need all that money because we're cuttin' down.

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's not their money, it's the taxpayers' money.

**MR. MILLER:** We only want to go up 3 percent so we'll send it back to Ottawa, and maybe they'll give it back to some of the taxpayers. You didn't say that did you. No way. No way. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's not their money. That's the difference between you and me you think it's . . . money.

**MR. MILLER:** I'm sure you said send more, send more, send more.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy is there. They are willing to take from the federal government. They'll still attack the federal government for being spendthrift. They'll still attack them, but they'll take their money. And then they'll say they're cheap because they're not giving more, and they will not match it. They won't even come near to matching it. And within just one year — one year — the proportion that the province is putting in toward health costs compared to what they're getting from Ottawa has dropped by half. That's restraint.

Is that honest restraint? No way. That's the way you cook books. You show a gross amount. You show a gross amount. And that's what Manitoba's spending, and this Minister gets up and says, "There's an increase of 6 percent. We're doing all right. Look at the increase in the hospitalization. Look at the increase in Medicare. It's big."

**MR. SHERMAN:** \$48 million.

**MR. MILLER:** That's right, it's big. How much of it is Manitoba money put in by this government?

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's all taxpayers' money, that's the point.

**MR. MILLER:** It's all taxpayers' money.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's the point. What you can't understand . . .

**MR. MILLER:** It is federal, it is money under the Established Program Financing . . .

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's not out of that money.

**MR. MILLER:** . . . which you, like every other minister, had a responsibility to put into Health Services.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's what you can't understand.

**MR. MILLER:** And use it, if you didn't want to use it for straight hospitalization, use it for alternatives, use it for personal care homes. Don't charge an extra 75 cents out of people in personal care homes taking advantage of a special \$20 payment of GIS — Guaranteed Income Supplement — that the federal government made January 1st. You included that in your calculations. You took back every penny of that \$20 that the federal government passed on to pensioners. Every penny of that \$20.00.

**MR. SHERMAN:** It comes from the money tree.

**MR. MILLER:** I know it comes from the money tree. And what are you so busy doing with it? You know, last year the Minister of Finance stood in this House, and he said, I'm going to make some changes in the Corporate Capital Tax. It's so much trouble for small firms to fill out these forms we're going to increase the level below which firms don't have to fill out the Corporate Capital Tax from I think it was \$150,000 to \$250,000.00. Or up to half a million. It's a nuisance tax. All we're going to lose is \$1.8 million. That's all. Boop. All we're going to lose is \$1.8 million.

**A MEMBER:** What's a million?

**MR. MILLER:** You know, what's a million? But this same Minister, when he's asked about community health centres, or anything else, he says "Well, you know, \$100,000 — \$50,000 — it's a lot of money". And I think last year he said "A penny saved is a dollar earned". But they just give up \$1.8 million in Corporate Capital Tax. They didn't cancel the tax, they just altered the base at which you have to pay it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, there's no saving in administration.

**MR. MILLER:** No, there's no saving in administration. They have less accounts that they have to look after. So, Mr. Speaker, the . . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. MILLER:** Well, when the brain known as the Attorney-General speaks up, I guess I have to listen. What is it?

**MR. MERCIER:** I couldn't hear the whole conversation.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, if you want to climb out here, I'm sure that you can listen in. No, I don't mind — I'll even step aside.

**A MEMBER:** Who's he talking to now? I can't hear him properly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. It makes it very difficult for the Hansard staff if we have several speakers at once. If we can just have one at a time.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** We have one too many anyway.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll get back on the money tree, not only once we'll get back on the money tree many times.

**A MEMBER:** NDP Money tree.

**MR. MILLER:** The NDP money tree, Mr. Speaker, which the Minister refers to is now going to turn out to be the tree from which this Conservative Party is going to be hung. Because what they are doing is such a betrayal of everything they promised, of everything they had pledged themselves to do before elected, is such a betrayal that they are not going to get away with it. People are

not damn fools. When this Minister got up last year, and he said "We have to cut back. We're only going to go to 3 percent, because, after all, we have to restrain", I think maybe there were people who felt, maybe, you know, let's go along with him.

But now they know, now when they find out the money that's coming to Manitoba from Ottawa, from the federal government, that they're not matching — they're not even coming close to matching — you wait till that filters through to people, and they realize that what they've had to accept in the way of lower services — and they've had lower services — that what they've had to accept they didn't really have to accept. They didn't really have to accept it at all because the money was there. And the money was there in spades. So, from now on, this government cannot point a finger at Ottawa. This government cannot hide behind — we have to restrain. No way. The money was there. They could have maintained the standards of service in Manitoba. They could have kept Manitoba in the forefront of health services, instead of seeing it slip as it is now. And it's slipping, and slipping badly. And I don't know how long it takes to recover from a slippage like that.

We're losing people, yes we are. The other day the Minister mentioned it is difficult to get a child psychiatrist. Yes. You know why? Not because of the money. They're leaving Manitoba. They can't work in this atmosphere. They're being squeezed. That's why. That's the reason they're leaving.

And, Mr. Speaker, lest some one thinks for a moment that I am defending the federal government here, let me tell you — not so. I think the federal government not only did a disavour to Canada, it betrayed Canadians when it went along with a proposal from some of the conservative provinces. It betrayed them. Absolutely. They didn't have to buy this formula or that formula and others. They could have said: "No, we are committed in Canada to a cost-sharing program so that Canadians from coast to coast can all receive a basic standard of care." They could have said that, but they didn't; they didn't. They wanted out too. I think they were quite happy when Alberta, Ontario, and B.C. pushed the way they did. They were quite happy to go along and those provinces did the work or choose their own company. You're darn right they did. So I'm not defending that.

But this government, the provincial government, is taking full advantage of a situation which developed, of which they were no part of, and instead of building on it, they are hiding behind it. They are getting out as fast as they can; they're spending as little as they can, they're letting a good system go to rack and ruin; they're misleading the public in how it's being done. Only now it's obvious, both in post-secondary and in health services, that in fact the Manitoba people are being short-changed. This government is trying to look good at the expense of Ottawa and to the expense of the people of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. MILLER:** Oh, I thought it was over. Okay, all right.

Mr. Speaker, I've been silent on one area, one matter, and that is Seven Oaks Hospital. I haven't made mention of it in this House because frankly, I knew Seven Oaks was going to go ahead no matter what happened on October 11th, 1977, and sure enough, shortly after the change of government the announcement was made it would go ahead. And I haven't bugged the Minister about when is it opening and so on; I know they have their problems. I have been aware of their problems.

But he talks about this — what did he call it? This monolith. I'm not sure what a monolith is; I'm not sure that I know what a monolith is. And he talks about a \$32 million over-building, and he says it's overbuilt; \$32 million. Does the Minister know that with the construction of Seven Oaks Hospital . . . Oh yes, he called it the "Tulchinsky Model". I've got news for him. That gentleman had absolutely nothing to do with the design of that hospital. I've got something else that I might share with you. He did not approve of that particular size of hospital for northwest Winnipeg, so if you have an ally, it's the gentleman you mentioned, so you're quite wrong in attributing anything to him.

But, let me tell you, the number of acute care beds in Winnipeg was not going to be increased at all. The Seven Oaks Hospital was part of a total plan for Greater Winnipeg. Seven Oaks Hospital was to be built; Health Sciences Centre was to be re-built and rationalized and the number of beds there reduced. Municipal hospitals, certain buildings were to be closed, so that in total across Winnipeg, the same number of acute care beds. Seven Oaks was just one block in an entire construction that was taking place within Greater Winnipeg. So when the Minister talks about over-building, or over-reaching too high an expense — nonsense, The number of acute care beds is going to remain the same. —(Interjection)— There was a slight reduction, but certainly never more than there is now. It was simply part of the total plan to provide acute care facilities.

But, and this I guess is what bugs the Minister. He wants a traditional hospital where if you're sick, you're carried in; and if you get well, you're either carried out or you walk out. The idea that



somehow there should be a hospital or a health service, which has a primary care unit, which has family practitioners, where families living in a neighbourhood could use that as a primary care; that bothers him. He says: "There's private doctors' offices; go there, go there". That's where he wants them to be. He doesn't want them to be on staff of the hospital, because he is married to that MMA concept of how you practice medicine — private practice. That's why. It's the entrepreneur in the medical field. He's their spokesman; he's their mouthpiece. That's what he is. —(Interjection)— They've got the monopoly; they've got it.

The idea that somehow a hospital should, in addition to these things that I'm talking about, also have an outreach for prevention to get into the communities for immunization programs; to get into the communities to work with children and adults and elderly; to prevent the need to go into the hospital; to prevent breakdowns; to prevent medical breakdowns. That's terrible; that's a terrible concept they have. No, you stay in your community, you have no access unless you go to a doctor — who really hasn't got time for you — you just don't do anything until the pressures that you're under are severe enough so that something medically shows up. Then, hallelujah; now you've got something to go to a doctor for and go to the hospital for. That's the idea; that's a beautiful idea.

You know, if there's ever going to be any hope at all in changing the pattern of delivering health, now is the time to do it, but not with this Minister. So I have to say to the Minister of Health and Social Services. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time is up unless he has unanimous consent.

**MR. MILLER:** Okay, thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, I want to say to this Minister of Health: the functional program of Seven Oaks Hospital is not inviolate, Mr. Speaker, I caution him that if he starts tampering with the Seven Oaks Hospital to the point where he tries to make it a free-standing acute care traditional facility, he will be doing it as a favour — not just to the people in that area — to all of Manitoba, and mostly to himself and to all the taxpayers of Manitoba, because that could be a model for the future and he's going to be denying it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that time is moving on. However, as you well know that on Interim Supply, this is an opportunity to question the government's programs in general. We're not going to be. . . —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Pembina — he wishes to make a speech about the birds, and he can make a speech about the birds at any time during the debate on this bill or any other. So, as other members in this House have participated in this debate, from both sides, today I would like to make my contribution.

And perhaps what prompted me mostly to participate in this debate, was a question that I had put to the Minister of Economic Development this morning, asking him about the Homestead Bill which just didn't seem to register with him at the time despite the fact that his leader, during the election campaign in 1977, had made reference to a homestead bill being one of his government's priorities; it's one of the first pieces of legislation they're going to bring in. Now I suppose the Minister could say, well, in bits and parts, they've done some of the things which were to have been contained within the Homestead Bill, but the very fact that the Minister responsible for the Housing Program, was completely unaware of this commitment having been made by his party.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it might be well to refresh our memories on some of the commitments and promises made by the government party during the last election campaign; to refresh our memories for the benefit of both sides of the House; for the benefit of our side with a view to our contribution and participation of the Estimates debate, and to refresh the memories of the Treasury Bench, to have them re-check the Estimates to satisfy themselves that those matters which they had promised the people of Manitoba, those programs which they had promised the people of Manitoba in 1977, are in fact provided for in the Estimates. Because I doubt very much whether some are. In fact, it would seem that many are not being provided for, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would want to give the government an opportunity to make whatever adjustments they can by way of Supplementary Supply to make provision to cover those commitments.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, in going back seventeen, eighteen months, to what had occurred then, I came across two statements which, I suppose, are true; they are correct. They are statements

from the press. One says: "Don't expect much from PCs". This is a headline of September 21st story. And that, Mr. Speaker, we have seen over the past eighteen months to be true; that there isn't much that we can expect from the PCs. About the same time: "Lyon tells Council of Chamber businessmen, PCs, to take less of your money". And that is true, Mr. Speaker. All the programs that this government has been introducing, is in the process of introducing, is of a kind, that's designed to take less of the Chamber of Commerce members' money, but more of someone else's money; more of the money of the person less able to pay. So that is true.

And then we go on, you know, looking back at what had transpired when the First Minister — before he became First Minister — said: "Don't expect much from PCs". That was said in conjunction with the unveiling of the 40-page "Bible" which that side of the House used at that time — whether they still do or not, I don't know; titled *The Challenges Ahead For Manitoba* — and it concluded with eleven points. —(Interjection)— No, that guy over there; he wrote ten on a stone tablet, but no, the First Minister, he wrote eleven, and some of which were — I'll read them to you, Mr. Speaker: "Protection for the citizen of traditional freedoms of choice and political economic cultural and social concerns. Respect for human dignity through programs for the elderly, the infirm, and those that are disadvantaged through no fault of their own. Encouragement of voluntarism. Acceptance of partnership between public and private sectors. Protection of individual rights against infringement by government business or labour. A pledge", now, Mr. Speaker, listen to this one and you will recall this morning's Question Period: "A pledge to make the government more open about its activities and the reasons for its decisions".

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, the answer we got this morning? "It's none of your business." You remember that, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure. And the next one is: "Increased emphasis on decision making at community levels". But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you know, this brings to mind, a story well known to many of my constituents. It's a story written by a Ukrainian writer, a Social Democrat, who wrote in the late 1800s, an essay about the state of affairs in Ukraine at the time that serfdom was abolished, something which is well remembered by my grandfather, and my great-grandfather, who was a serf, as were millions of other people in Ukraine at that time. And, in part — I'm not going to go into the . . . although the entire story is of tremendous relevance to what has happened in the House. I am not going to deal with the entire story at this time, but I will deal with one portion of it.

There was a tremendous amount of publicity to the matter that serfdom was abolished and to the fact that the Austro-Hungarian government had provided the people of western Ukraine with a constitution guaranteeing certain rights, a constitution granting the Ukrainians certain freedoms, and on and on and on. And there were a number of people gathered around the village well, saying how happy they were that they were no longer serfs and that not only are they no longer serfs, but here is this constitution guaranteeing their rights.

So the old village philosopher came along and he listened to this conversation for a while and he said, "You know, you're all pleased with the fact that there is a constitution guaranteeing us certain rights and that we are free to do what we wish to do, go where we wish to go and so forth.

But," he says, "You know that constitution is for the pigs." Now that leads into another sub-chapter of the story, so I won't explain why he titled it that, but suffice to say that someone asked him, he says, "Well, now look, grandpa, we have a constitution. Why are you being so critical of it?" So he says, "Well, look. In brief, I'll explain it to you. It's true; we have a constitution which guarantees us certain rights, which, and it sounds beautiful on paper, but," he says, "even though that constitution made us free men, that constitution did not give us any land. The land is still in the hands of the same landlords who owned it previously. And despite the constitution, we still have to go with cap in hand on bended knee to the same landlord and negotiate with him for the rental of a plot of land to grow some grain to grind into flour to bake into bread to feed our family, and pay him whatever rent that he may desire, because we have no choice. We have no choice. Because nothing really has changed in the economic state of affairs." So therefore, that's what he thought of the constitution of the day in the Ukraine. And much the same can be said, Mr. Speaker, of the eleven, whatever one would want to call them, in the final chapter of this government's document entitled — "Revelations", my colleague has said, the book of Revelations. The last eleven verses of the last chapter of the Conservative Party's book of Revelations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's just remind ourselves of some of the promises that were made to the people of Manitoba. And let's take a look at them in the light of what had transpired over the past seventeen months, in the light of what is contained in the Estimates, a portion of which we are in the process of considering at this time under the provisions of this Bill. At the time, yes at the time that the First Minister, then the Leader of the Conservative Party, in speaking to the Chamber of Commerce said that his government would get business to create new positions, that they would expect business to open up new and meaningful jobs for Manitoba's handicapped. Mr.

Speaker, could we ask this government how many jobs they have created for Manitoba's handicapped? Where are those jobs? Where are the handicapped who are now being employed, pursuant to job programs, either developed by this government or stimulated or motivated by this government? You know, by the private sector, stimulated and motivated by this government. Where are they, Mr. Speaker? How many?

As well, Lyon said business would be expected to create positions for many of Winnipeg's native people, who at present number about 40,000. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we were to phone the office of the native organization in Winnipeg, and let's check with them to see how many jobs were created for the native people in Winnipeg. How many of these 40,000 that the First Minister was looking at that jobs have been created for. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you it's zero. —(Interjection)— Minus 61, I understand.

Construction firms, oh yes, oh, this is a beautiful one, Mr. Speaker. Construction firms would be asked to build less expensive homes for first starters. You know, Mr. Speaker, this happens to be a matter of personal concern to my family. I have a daughter who is graduating from school, and hoping to eventually in a year or two to marry, and she and her fiance are — every day they pick up the paper and they look through the ads, you know, they remember what the First Minister said, in September of 1977, and they're looking for the advertisements advertising these homes that would be built. Less expensive homes that they, as first if they will be able starters — two young people of modest income — to get a job, that's another problem, Mr. Speaker, is to get a job in Manitoba. It so happened that, you know, about \$20,000 was spent out of the public purse in training my daughter at a post-secondary institution, and the first job offer came from Vancouver and not from Manitoba. And the second from North Dakota. So we spent \$20,000 to train somebody to go to work there, which she is reluctant to, and she still has hopes that she'll be able to find a job here. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's the way it is with her at the present time, and I'm sure with many others.

Then, what were some of the other promises made? What did the First Minister say to the Civil Service. Well, he said, there will not be any witch hunts or anything of that nature. YEES, ON September 8th, though the Conservative leader, Sterling Lyon, he promised the Civil Service there will not be any witch hunts or anything of that nature. And I repeat again, this is in quotes, Mr. Speaker. This isn't some newspaper reporter's paraphrasing, of what he thought he heard the Leader say. But he is quoting him, and the quote begins, "There will not be any witch hunts or anything of that nature".

And then, oh, now here are some other promises, Mr. Speaker. The Tory platform also includes, "Major changes in education policy". Yes, and we know what the major changes have been. We've seen them. The 400 percent increase in tuition fees in our community colleges. The increases in tuition fees at our universities. Those are the major changes in education policy. A revised City of Winnipeg charter and, oh, more nursing homes, programs encouraging private home ownership and improved park and recreational facilities. And then he concludes by saying, Mr. Speaker, "Government must", and he is being quoted again, "Provide services for people that people cannot provide for themselves." Provide services for people that people cannot provide for themselves. And then a couple of days later, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was at Swan River. He goes up to Swan River to campaign on behalf of a member who was elected, and you know, it's rather interesting, because his name was touted about by the press as eventually a possible Minister of Municipal Affairs or Minister of Agriculture or — what else was he considered for? Those t o. Well, he lost out on both. And there w are a few other losers in the back bench.

Somehow, he didn't get the appointment. And the First Minister said in Swan River, that the government would set up a \$4 million fund immediately to help lower and middle income senior citizens remain in their homes. He told about 300 supporters at a meeting for Swan River PC candidate Doug Guerley. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps either the Minister responsible for housing or the First Minister or the Minister of Finance could indicate to us just where in the Estimates those \$4 million are.

And, oh, yes, and property taxes for all. This is also Swan River. Property taxes for all other home owners could be reduced by increasing the provincial government's contribution to education, Mr. Lyon said. And this was said, Mr. Speaker, by the man occupying that centre seat in the front bench, the First Minister of this government. . .

In the one minute remaining, at this sitting, now here he demonstrates his business expertise, you know, and the business expertise of all those fellows on that side of the House. It reads like a comic book. He says, "Making buses and selling them at one half to two-thirds of cost seems like a funny way to do business." I know. It really warms the cockles of my heart to know we're providing assistance to the poor down-trodden citizens of San Francisco So instead, what is this Minister doing? What is the government doing? Well, now perhaps it's upon the free advice that he is receiving from — no, no there are two others. There was Riley and somebody else that, oh

yes, ex-businessman ready to aid at MDC disposals. J. Derek Riley, not Conrad. And Edson Boyd, two retired Winnipeg businessmen have volunteered to advise the provincial government on the best means of disposing of companies now owned by the MDC.

So what do they advise? And what does has the government done? Has given away Morden Fine Foods, has given awy away the boat, is in the process of giving away, oh, oh, and has given away Saunders Aircraft, is hiding Tantalum, is in the process of giving away Gull Harbour Lodg Mr. Speaker. You know, the very thing that e, the Minister says, "Oh no, we would never do that. My, you know, we would never sell a bus at below cost, you know, to subsidize to assist somebody in San Francisco. Here he's taking away, robbing the people of Manitoba of the very assets that they own. -30

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 4:30, when this subject next comes up, the honourable member will have 22 minutes. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is general agreement that we do not proceed with Private Members Hour this afternoon, and therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.